



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO.        |  |  |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 09/892,586  | 06/27/2001     | Paul Turner          | 1086.2002-001           | 2279                    |  |  |
| 21005 7   | 590 11/14/2005 |                      | EXAM                    | EXAMINER                |  |  |
| HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD |                |                      | SHARON                  | SHARON, AYAL I          |  |  |
| P.O. BOX 913  |                |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER            |  |  |
| CONCORD, MA 01742-9133                                    |                |                      | 2123                    |                         |  |  |
|   | ,              |                      | DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005 | DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005 |  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |  |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| 09/892,586      | TURNER ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |  |
| Ayal I. Sharon  | 2123          |  |  |

|   | Ayai i. Sharon  | - 1  | 2123  |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet v  | with the co                                  | rrespondence add  | ress                                      |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A   | APPLICATION IN CONDIT   | TION FOR                                     | ALLOWANCE.  |   |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:  | the same day as filing a<br>ving replies: (1) an amend<br>tice of Appeal (with appea          | Notice of A<br>dment, affic<br>al fee) in co | ppeal. To avoid aba<br>lavit, or other eviden<br>empliance with 37 Cl | ice, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)            |
| a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date  | of the final rejection.   |  |   |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a)  | ater than SIX MONTHS from   | the mailing                                  | date of the final rejection   | on.                                       |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   |   |  |   |   |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL   | tension and the correspondir<br>shortened statutory period for<br>than three months after the | ng amount o<br>r reply origin                | f the fee. The appropri<br>ally set in the final Offic                | ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41  | .37(e)), to a                                | avoid dismissal of th   |   |
| AMENDMENTS  |   |  |   |   |
| 3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, [a] They raise new issues that would require further composite to the composite that the composite the composite that the compos | nsideration and/or search   |  |   | ecause                                    |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or  | • •   | aterially red                                | ucing or simplifying f  | the issues for                            |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a  |   | finally reje                                 | cted claims.  |   |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1   | • • • •   |  |   |   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13  |   | of Non-Con                                   | ipliant Amendment (   | PTOL-324).                                |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)  |   |  |   |   |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).   |   | •  | •   | •   |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |  | be entered and an e   | explanation of                            |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |   |  |   |   |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:  |   |  |   |   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |  |   |   |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |  |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |   |  |   |   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary   | vercome all rejections un   | ider appeal                                  | and/or appellant fai  | ls to provide a                           |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |  |   | •   |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  | t does NOT place the app  | olication in                                 | condition for allowar   | ice because:                              |
| 12. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (  | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449  | ) Paper No                                   |   | ,   |
| 13.   |   | /  | and Illed   |   |
|   |   | Pau  | l L. Rodr   | iguez                                     |
|   |   | Pr   | imary Examine<br>Art Unit 2125  | er  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Application No. 09/892,586

## Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to the independent claims that were intended to overcome the 101 rejections added new limitations that direct these claims to the control systems and polymer process control arts. This will require an updated search in those classes. In addition, the Examiner will need to evaluate if the well known Calculus methodoloy of setting first derivitives to zero in order to find local max and min is prior art in the new art classes, and whether it reads on the claims .